

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 96-388, as amended by Public Law 97-84, and Public Law 106-292, appoints the following Senators to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council for the 117th Congress: The Honorable BERNARD SANDERS of Vermont; The Honorable BENJAMIN L. CARDIN of Maryland; and The Honorable JACKY ROSEN of Nevada.

The Chair announces, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to Public Law 101-509, the reappointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress: Denise A. Hibay of New York.

The Chair announces, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 100-458, sec. 114(b)(2)(c), the appointment of the following individual to serve a six-year term as a member of the Board of Trustees of the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development: The Honorable CHRISTOPHER A. COONS of Delaware (term expiring 2026).

The Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 116-92, appoints the following individual to serve as a member of the Commission on Combating Synthetic Opioid Trafficking: Dewardric LeRon McNeal of Maryland vice The Honorable Kathleen H. Hicks, PhD, of Virginia.

The Chair announces, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to Public Law 70-770, the reappointment of the following individual to the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission: The Honorable MARTIN HEINRICH of New Mexico (reappointment).

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 94-304, as amended by Public Law 99-7, appoints the following Senators as members of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki Commission) during the 117th Congress: The Honorable BENJAMIN L. CARDIN of Maryland (and designate him Chairman) The Honorable SHELDON WHITEHOUSE of Rhode Island; The Honorable JEANNE SHAHEEN of New Hampshire; The Honorable RICHARD BLUMENTHAL of Connecticut; and The Honorable TINA SMITH of Minnesota.

NATIONAL WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 123.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. 123) designating March 2021 as "National Women's History Month".

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. KING. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 123) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of March 18, 2021, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

RECOGNIZING THE HERITAGE, CULTURE, AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF AMERICAN INDIAN, ALASKA NATIVE, AND NATIVE HAWAIIAN WOMEN IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 125.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 125) recognizing the heritage, culture, and contributions of American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian women in the United States.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. KING. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 125) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of March 18, 2021, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 937

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 937) to facilitate the expedited review of COVID-19 hate crimes, and for other purposes.

Mr. KING. I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 24, 2021

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10:30 a.m., Wednesday, March 24; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the nominations, as provided under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator SULLIVAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

NOMINATION OF MARTIN JOSEPH WALSH

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, it is not often I come down to the floor to say I have a lot in common with the Senate majority leader, Senator SCHUMER from New York. In fact, in my 6 years in the Senate, I don't think I have ever done that.

But after reading his remarks prior to the vote that we took yesterday on the Secretary of Labor, Marty Walsh, I thought I would come down and make a few points on that nominee, that vote, and some issues I have in common with the majority leader and now-Secretary Walsh and maybe some issues I don't have so much in common with the majority leader but I think I do have with Secretary Walsh, which is why I voted for him.

First, as I mentioned, I, too, supported our now-Secretary of Labor, Marty Walsh, for some of the reasons that Senator SCHUMER did. Let me explain. Secretary Walsh started in the Laborers' Union, Local 223, in Boston, age 21, following in his father's footsteps. Now, as many people know, the Laborers are the biggest building construction union in the country. They build things—pipelines, roads, oil wells, bridges. They have made America strong. I am a big fan of Laborers and leaders like Joey Merritt back home and Terry O'Sullivan, whom I am going to talk a little bit about.

Secretary Walsh followed his father's example and joined the Laborers in

Boston. He is also the son of Irish immigrants, which is something that is near and dear to my heart. And Senator SCHUMER said he has something very much in common—yesterday, when he spoke about Secretary Walsh—with Secretary Walsh because his grandfather was an immigrant from Eastern Europe who also, when he came over to America, got very involved with the labor movement. That is really a very common, powerful story of the American dream, common to millions—Senator SCHUMER's family, Secretary Walsh's family, and it is certainly a story that I have in common with those two.

You see, my great-grandfather was from a family of Irish immigrants, and he was also very involved in the labor movement. In fact, he was one of the original cofounders of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the IBEW. He was its first grand marshal.

I have something I am quite proud of here. It is a page from the history books of the IBEW, talking about my great-grandfather's great work for the IBEW when it first got off the ground.

I look forward to working with Secretary Walsh on helping the men and women in America, certainly in my State, who build things. They have succeeded. They rise up and help others rise up—other working men and women—the way Secretary Walsh's father did, the way Senator SCHUMER's grandfather did, the way my great-grandfather did. It is a great American story.

But I must say that my views and Senator SCHUMER's diverge on some of the other things he may have been speaking about when he talked about Secretary Walsh's nomination yesterday.

One, he was critical of some of the Trump administration's Department of Labor policies as related to the men and women who build things—these working men and women—despite the fact that prior to the pandemic, with some of the policies that we implemented here, the United States had the strongest economy in decades, the lowest unemployment rate in 50 years, wages were finally going up after 2 decades of stagnation. And very importantly for the working men and women of this country, there was a huge expansion and boom in the American energy sector, “all of the above” energy: oil, gas, renewables, as important to the Presiding Officer as it is to Alaska.

Let me describe one other narrative that I believe certainly is true that I have seen in my professional life in Alaska—in America but certainly back home in my State—and that is the narrative that I am not so sure my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to highlight. But I am going to highlight it because I think it is really important, particularly now, and it is this: When national Democrats, whether during the Obama administration or now, during the Biden administration,

are set up with the choice where they have to choose between the interests of the working men and women in this country who build things versus the interests of the extremists—radical environmental groups who want to kill jobs and shut them down—they almost always side with these groups who kill jobs, not the working men and women of America, not the working men and women of Alaska.

This is true. My colleagues sometimes don't want to admit it, but it is true. Do you know who else has seen it, and do you know who else I believe knows it is true? Secretary Walsh as a laborer. He has seen it. That is another reason why I voted for him.

He and his fellow laborers, whether in Boston or Alaska, also know that this issue is true. When there is a choice between the working men and women of America who build things versus the extremists who want to shut things down, way too often, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle go with the extremists, not the men and women who build things in this country.

Now, this narrative is not only continuing under the Biden administration; it is accelerating, and it has been bad for Alaska, bad for America, bad for working families, and, to be honest, it is a bit surprising. President Biden came into office talking about his blue collar roots, but right now, the record is anything but supporting the men and women who build things.

Here is a snapshot of what is going on in my State. In the first 4 weeks of the Biden administration, there were eight Executive orders focused on Alaska—eight. No other State has had that many Executive orders focused on Alaskan working families.

Day one, ANWR—trying to shut that down. We got that done in this body. They also killed the Keystone Pipeline—10,000 jobs, laborers' jobs. Marty Walsh knows a lot about that. It goes on and on and on. There are Executive orders right now that, from my State's perspective, are focused on hurting working men and women.

There is another one I will talk about. It is a project we have, a big energy project in Alaska called the Willow project. This has been permitted by Democratic and Republican administrations for 25 years to finally get it going—the Clinton administration, the Obama administration, the Trump administration, everybody. It is in the National Petroleum Reserve of Alaska, a place set aside by Congress over 70 years ago for oil and gas development and good jobs. It is not controversial at all. The Biden administration has put a hold on that. Here is the estimate. It is a \$7 billion project that will produce American energy and an estimated 2,000 direct jobs on the Willow project. This isn't some pie-in-the-sky project that we were starting this winter. There were 2,000 direct jobs, 75 percent of which are union jobs, and they are saying “We are going to put a hold on

it”—thousands of additional supporting jobs, and they are going to put a hold on that. Why? Well, we know why, because in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, some of the most extreme radical environmental groups in the country sued to stop it, and they were successful.

So guess what happened in Alaska this winter during a recession. The 2,000 men and women who were working on this project were given pink slips and told to go home. That is what happened.

Mr. President, don't just take my word for it. I want to quote again from Terry O'Sullivan. He is the head of the Laborers, the biggest construction union in the country. This was his reaction after day one of the Biden administration, where there was a choice of working men and women who build things like pipelines or the radical extremist environmental groups who want to shut down and kill American jobs. It is a choice—day one, the radical environmentalists win.

Here is what the head of the Laborers—remember, Marty Walsh, Secretary Walsh is a Laborer from Boston. Here is what the head of the Laborers, the great American Terry O'Sullivan, said:

The Biden administration's decision to cancel the Keystone XL pipeline permit on day one of his presidency is both insulting and disappointing to the thousands of hard-working LIUNA members—

Those are the Laborers.

—who will lose good-paying, middle class family-supporting jobs.

By blocking this 100 percent union project, and pandering to environmental extremists—

Remember, this is Terry O'Sullivan talking, not Senator SULLIVAN talking.

—a thousand union jobs will immediately vanish and 10,000 additional jobs will be foregone.

That is Terry O'Sullivan. Remember the choice: Men and women who build things and make our country great versus extremist groups like the Center for Biological Diversity—they go with the extremists.

Here is Mark McManus, general president of the United Association of Union Plumbers and Pipefitters. They were going to build the Keystone Pipeline, too, just like LIUNA members:

In revoking this permit, the Biden Administration has chosen to listen to the voices of fringe activists instead of union members and the American consumer on Day 1 [of the Biden administration]. Let me be . . . clear.

This is Mark McManus still talking.

When built with union labor by the men and women of the United Association, pipelines like Keystone XL remain the safest and most efficient modes of energy transportation in the world. Sadly, the Biden Administration has now put thousands of union members and workers out of work.

This is why the Secretary of Labor we just confirmed—and I was glad to support him because he is a Laborer. He knows how to build things. He knows these politics. This is why it is important to have his voice because

the voice of the extremist is much stronger in this administration. It is not just policies of killing union jobs—the men and women who build things for America—but if you listen, it is how the new members of this administration talk about these jobs. Listen. You have to listen, and what you hear is a condescending tone as it relates to these jobs. You may have heard John Kerry and Gina McCarthy, the climate change czars in the White House, who were saying in one of their press conferences that we need to help people make “better choices” on their jobs. That is pretty condescending. They are talking about laborers. They are talking about my oil and gas workers in the great State of Alaska or in Colorado.

The Secretary of Energy, in her confirmation hearing, talked about how some of the jobs might have to be “sacrificed.”

Even in the Environment and Public Works Committee—and I am a very bipartisan guy—some of my Senate colleagues on the other side of the aisle were recently talking about: We need to encourage people to get more “relevant jobs.”

What is more relevant than powering America?

Until recently, the men and women who built America—pipelines, oil and gas rigs, roads, bridges, the men and women with dirt under their fingernails—were celebrated, which is as they should be. They built this country. They powered this country. They won wars for this country. By the way, they often fought in wars for this country. Then they came home. They got good jobs in the building trades as laborers, operating engineers, pipefitters, teamsters, IBEWs—the IBEW like my great-grandfather helped start. Not so much anymore.

The new Secretary of Energy is now calling them “fossil workers” who are from “fossil communities.” I am not kidding. Listen to her. I have been trying to give them a little bit of advice: Don’t use that term. It is condescending. You are talking to workers as if they are some kind of dinosaur that should be put in a museum. Communities? Fossil communities? Really?

Madam Secretary, if you are listening, ditch that language. It drips with an attitude of being condescending toward these great Americans.

Well, I was just home in my State with a bunch of these so-called “fossil workers” this past weekend. These are some of the best, most patriotic Americans anywhere. They are tough; they are hard-working; they love their country, but I will tell you they are concerned. They are concerned. Why? Because they know that exactly what I have been talking about here is happening—the radical, extremist environmental groups want to kill and are killing jobs.

By the way, as for that lawsuit I talked about on the Willow Project, 200 Alaskans were sent home during a re-

cession. Men and women who have to pay mortgages and pay tuitions were sent home.

So my workers in the great State of Alaska are concerned. They know that these groups they are sending have a beeline into the White House and that they want to kill jobs—energy jobs—in my State and in America. They are worried that the majority now, the Senate majority, has similar views, so they are nervous.

Yet I am hopeful on one thing. Given his background and his heritage—now I am talking about the Secretary of Labor, Secretary Walsh.

I believe that, when the decisions are made—and I hope when the decisions are being made in the Biden administration to kill more good-paying energy jobs that built this country—and when they are coming before the Biden administration, the new Secretary of Labor is going to stand up for the working men and women, stand up for the laborers in Boston whom he knows so well or the laborers in Alaska whom he knows so well and look at the other Cabinet members and say: Not on my watch. We are not going to kill any more of these jobs.

That is what I am hopeful for. That is what he committed to me to do, and that is why I voted for Secretary Walsh as the new Secretary of Labor.

FILIBUSTER

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I have one more topic I would like to talk about today. It is another important one, and it is one that many have been talking about here on the floor of the U.S. Senate. Many have spoken very eloquently about this topic, and depending on when they have spoken about it—this year, this week, last year, a decade ago, a century ago—it is a topic that is really fundamental to this institution, and it looks as if Members in this institution are trying to change the institution forever. Now, I am talking about the filibuster.

As you know, there has been much talk recently about the possibility of getting rid of the filibuster. This is an action that will fundamentally transform this institution, certainly, but I believe, frankly, it will transform our country. I don’t think this is a wise move at all. The irony is—and I am going to talk about it—until very recently, the vast majority of my colleagues, Republican and Democratic, were in agreement on this topic in that getting rid of the legislative filibuster was not a wise move for the Senate and not a wise move for America.

Now, this might seem like an insular issue—something that people in Washington, DC, get incensed about, wound up about, and the people back home might not necessarily care because it might not impact them—but I don’t think that this is the case at all. This rule, the filibuster, is at the very heart of what keeps extreme legislation, pushed by a small minority of the pub-

lic, from passing. It is a rule that, in the Senate, certainly encourages, if not demands, compromise and bipartisan work both when one’s party is in or out of power.

Now, look, our instincts as Senators—all of our instincts—are to get things done for our States, for our country, but what is good for Alaska isn’t always good for Colorado, and what is good for Colorado isn’t always good for New York. What is good for the majority isn’t always good for the minority and vice versa and isn’t always good for the Nation. That is the heart of federalism. It is also why the majority can’t wield unfettered power in the U.S. Senate. With the exception of a few laws, what is required here is typically 60 votes on legislation. It is what separates this body, the Senate, from the House.

For the good of the country, if you look at our history, we must work together, find compromise, find consensus, find solutions, particularly on major legislation, to get a broad-based buy-in from all Americans or most Americans. This is what the filibuster has required.

Remember, the Framers understood that, here in the Senate, we would be different from the House. We would be the bulwark against what James Madison called an anchor, a necessary fence, against the fickleness and passions that pervade the House. No offense to our Members of the House of Representatives, but as George Washington is said to have told Thomas Jefferson, the Framers created the Senate to cool House legislation. It was the cooling saucer you had with regard to the tea in the cup.

Indeed, the Senate—often referred to as the “world’s greatest deliberative body” in its earliest days—was founded on the right of unlimited debate. That is what the filibuster is. Even in the first session of the Senate in 1789, Senators used this right to debate and debate and debate in order to delay consideration of legislation. It wasn’t until the mid-1800s that this tactic was coined the “filibuster.”

The point is that this procedural rule in the Senate has been here, in one form or another, since the founding of the Republic, and when you hear my colleagues talk about it as some new, recent procedure, it is just not factually accurate. Before the 1900s, there was no formal procedure to even end debate if a Senator chose to talk a bill to death. It wasn’t until 1917, during a debate about arming Merchant Marine vessels during World War I, that the Senate established the cloture tool, giving the body the ability to end debate by a certain margin of Senators.

Now, as some of my colleagues have been debating recently and have mentioned throughout its history, we have seen the filibuster, cloture used for good. We have used it to stop legislation, and it has also been used for ill—to delay much needed, historic reforms like civil rights legislation during the